

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 4. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 4, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of same.

112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1 - 4, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of same.

101 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 4 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1 - 4, rewriting same as claims 5 - 11, to more clearly identify the steps of the process, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of same. The Applicant has provided herewith form PTO/SB/06 for the Examiner's convenience.

102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Kloba et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,042). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 2, but herein responds to the rejection as applicable to new claims 5 - 8, which incorporate substantially all of the elements of original claims 1 and 2.

In Kloba et al. '042, there is a requirement for two applications, one on the mobile device and the other on a server. These two applications must synchronize to communicate their data. Thus, any new user must install the application of Kloba et al. '042 on their device to be able to access the server. This technology is an example of what is utilized by DHL Express and similar companies. This technology requires both a server-based application and a mobile device-based application to be installed before operation can commence.

Applicant's invention, to the contrary, requires only a server-based application that is accessed by any type of browser on the mobile device. No specific application to manipulate data is required to be installed on the mobile device. The only requirement of the mobile device is that it can access the Internet.

In the invention of Kloba et al. '042, the mobile device is specifically required to store the data that it wishes to manipulate and synchronize said data with the server (column 5, lines 35-62), and, thus, the device of Kloba et al. '042 is limited to its memory capability. To the contrary, Applicant's invention accesses data directly on the server in real time, manipulating same without a need for synchronization. The only data-processing application required is on the server and the mobile device need only be able to access the Internet.

Accordingly, in view of Applicant's traversal of Examiner's rejection of original claims 1 and 2, new independent claims 5 and 6 should be allowed. Further, in view of Applicant's new independent claims 5 and 6, all claims depending therefrom should be allowable.

103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kloba et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,042) in view of Haynes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,110,968). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 4, but herein responds to the rejection as applicable to new claims 9 - 11, which incorporate substantially all of the elements of original claims 3 and 4.

Accordingly, in view of Applicant's traversal of Examiner's rejection of original claims 1 and 2 as hereinabove as to Kloba et al. '042, and Applicant's new independent claims 5 and 6, new claims 9 - 11 depending from claim 6 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully believes that that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, she is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted, this 2nd day of September, 2008,



Thomas R. Williamson III, Esq.

Reg. No. 47,180

Email: twilliamson@trwiplaw.com

WILLIAMSON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC

1870 The Exchange, Suite 100

Atlanta, GA 30339

Phone: 770-777-0977

Fax: 770-777-0975